

## **Hanford Reach National Monument Federal Advisory Committee**

### **Discussion of Subcommittee Reports Comments Compiled from December 4, 2003 FAC Meeting**

#### Valid Existing Rights subcommittee

- Valid existing rights reach beyond goals of the Service, and will be complied with, according to Service policy, and addressed up front in the Plan. Any objective that addresses valid existing rights should be collapsed into other goals.

#### Cultural & Historical Resources subcommittee

- Timeframe for Monument Watch: earlier is better than later.
- Treaty rights deleted because it illuminates the fact that this is not an option to choose to achieve.

#### Aquatic Natural Resources subcommittee

- Would you not want a more complete inventory and focus on areas where public access would occur first?
- Concern that where there is more use and access, there is more need for research (first line, p.2).
- The years should all be the same. The subcommittee struggled with years – from a biological perspective it did not make sense. Rather, a different level of review was the approach.
- The pie of resource allocation is bigger for alternative B and smaller for alternative D. Management has to pick where to do the activity, so priority is given to areas where use would occur.
- Clarification: focus research “where facilities and use will be concentrated” first. Cursory means in-depth but over a smaller area
- Try using “focused” instead of “cursory.”
- Tribes are not stakeholders. Revise to “stakeholders and Tribes....”
- Important to include Tribes in decisions about how to spend resource dollars. Tribes should be at table and given consideration on management decisions.
- Did you discuss pike minnow?
- FWS has a Section 7 consultation responsibility with the Columbia River as a Monument resource, although it goes beyond the boundary of the Monument.
- Are the Columbia River and the fall Chinook part of the Monument resources? Yes – called out in Proclamation.

#### Terrestrial Natural Resources subcommittee

- Suggest consideration be given to chemical treatments so not creating a problem for use as foods and medicines with regard to Treaty resources.
- The research topics could be broader under alternative D; spatial data issues.

- Important to have a policy discussion before making an assumption about restoring upland habitat to re-establish to pre-European settlement conditions (p.3); refer to Proclamation on this.
- Partnerships should not identify specific contractors (p.4), or say “such as.”
- Suggest a “local representative committee,” perhaps academic or scientific, for reviewing research proposals (p.6).
- Priority should be given to research that benefits the Monument.
- Need to be good stewards/good neighbors.
- Why did you specify only one research standard (p.5)? Concern about wording “restore habitat to conditions before research started....” The standards book would require all this. Either spell all of them out in the objective or just refer to a set of standards.
- Goals are in line to restore habitat to pre-European. It can be supported; fully agree with subcommittee to say this is a goal even though it may not be reached.
- It is important to call out that the researcher’s use be respectful of the resources.
- Under “disturbance events” (p.3), there is no mention of prevention or containment of fire. Was it an oversight?
- Organize research scenario around permit.
- Like to see some suggestion of elk hunting objectives in Terrestrial Natural Resources (from Public Use and Access discussion).

#### Public Use & Access subcommittee

- Surprised at the consideration of an undeveloped White Bluffs campsite due to deterioration (p.3).
- Hunting on ALE only appeared once; hoped for variation about control, and being good neighbors. Group edit: if there were hunts to manage elk, should be open to all and based on scientific research data.
- Controlled hunts of some type like guided, horse, bow and arrow are a way to be good neighbor.
- Hunting on ALE – wildlife management 101 – if needed to manage the elk herd (i.e. production exceeding culling). On the public use side – there is an opportunity to provide a high quality hunt.
- Like to see some suggestion of elk hunting objectives in Terrestrial Natural Resources.
- Add consideration to Tribal sensitivity on access (p.1).
- A Tribal hunt could be a tool that would be utilized for elk management.
- Concern over ad hoc boat launch at Vernita (p.3).
- Enforcement – Today, can only launch certain size boat. With bigger boats, want more enhancements.
- Solitude on the Monument (p.6) – Tribes are exempt because of spiritual existing rights.
- Rattlesnake Mountain – is everything included?
- Consider in hunting – were the elk native? Did they have predators? Establish a long-term vision.
- Two areas on ALE are still controlled by DOE: borrow pits and observatory.

- Thought the Committee already gave advice that management should not be held to boundaries, roads, etc. It is important to look past those old boundaries and craft a public use according to sensitive resources. Do analysis of bigger landscape.

#### General

- Prioritization on the Plan. What is most important?
- Deal with what is realistic and achievable but have vision for what we want it to be like.
- Identify the areas for a more focused approach:
  - From State's perspective, principles of where we want elk management to head, with a short and long-term view
  - Boat access to the River
- Develop a range of alternatives for an EIS focus.
- Committee could consider a specific elk damage recommendation to deal with short term.